



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2025

by **Megan Thomas K.C.** Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/24/3356498

42 Mallard Close, Bournemouth BH8 9GP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Zak Lacey against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch, and Poole Council.
 - The application ref. is 7-2024-5972-G.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two storey side and front extension at 42 Mallard Close, Bournemouth BH8 9GP in accordance with the terms of planning application ref.7-2024-5972-G dated 12 September 2024 subject to the following conditions:
 - (1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.
 - (2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: Site and location plan: J24034-001, Proposed plans: J24034-004 & Proposed elevations: J24034-005.
 - (3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the main building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a residential area comprising rows of terraced two storey dwellings of a simple and fairly modern design. It is an end dwelling which has a front and rear garden and a conservatory to the side. The conservatory is almost the full depth of the side wall.
4. The dwellings along Mallard Close are grouped in twos threes and fours and are staggered, thereby varying front building lines, with intermittent gaps between the groups of dwellings. Behind the Close sits a public footpath which separates it from Seagull Road. Some dwellings

in the area have front porches, single storey rear extensions and there are a few examples of two storey extensions.

5. The dwelling in the next row of terraces to the south east of the appeal site is no.40 Mallard Close and this stands closer to the road than the appeal site and is orientated slightly away from no.42.
6. The proposal is to erect a two-storey wraparound front and side extension. It would be about 7.7m wide, with about 2.9m of that being connected to the proposed side extension which would extend rearwards to meet the existing rear elevation with a total length of about 7.2m.
7. The proposed 1.3m projection forward would match the distance that the existing porch extends from the main house and the side extension would be a similar footprint to the conservatory but rising to two storeys. The proposed two-storey front/side extension would be set down from the host dwelling's ridge height by approximately 0.9m, which would create a subservient extension.
8. Whilst the bulk of the dwelling would increase, the proposal would harmonize with the existing building, and this would be aided by the grouped fenestration at the south-eastern end of the front elevation and the use of a cladding panel. The appearance would be balanced. The proposed roof would be shallow and modestly sized. The use of brown cladding would reflect materials already found on nearby dwellings, many of which feature brown finishes.
9. Owing to the varying building lines and staggered arrangement of dwellings along Mallard Close, the front elevation of the proposal would remain comfortably behind the building line of no.40 to the south east. A sizeable gap would remain between the two dwellings and there would be no conflict with paragraph 3.3 of the Residential Extensions Design Guide (2008). The particular location and siting of no.42 relative to its neighbours would permit the resulting development to be reasonably unobtrusive in the streetscene.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not unduly harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. It would not conflict policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted 2012) or the Residential Extensions Design Guide (2008).

Conditions

11. The Council suggested some conditions in the event that the appeal was successful. I have considered these in the light of advice in National Planning Practice Guidance. In order to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area I have imposed a condition which requires external surfaces of the extension to match those of the existing dwelling. For the avoidance of doubt, a condition ties the proposal to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion

12. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I allow the appeal and grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Megan Thomas K.C.
Inspector